



კორნელი კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს
ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი

KORNELI KEKELIDZE GEORGIAN
NATIONAL CENTRE OF MANUSCRIPTS

თბილისი • TBILISI

2023

M RAVALTAVI

Philological and Historical
Researches

Published since 1971

29

ქართული
რეალთაუი

ფილოლოგიურ-ისტორიული
ძიგანი

გამოდის 1971 წლიდან

„მრავალთავის“ 29-ე ტომში წარმოდგენილია ფილოლოგიურ-კოდიკოლოგიური და წყაროთმცოდნეობით-ისტორიული ხასიათის ნარკვევები, რომლებიც ეძღვნება ქართული მწერლობის, ისტორიისა და კულტურის საკითხებს, აგრეთვე, 2022 წლის ქრონიკა ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრის მიერ და ცენტრის მეცნიერ თანამშრომლების მონაწილეობით ჩატარებული კონფერენციების, სემინარების, გამოფენების, ექსპედიციამივლინებების შესახებ. მკითხველი ასევე გაეცნობა ინფორმაციას ცენტრის მიერ 2022 წელს გამოცემული წიგნების შესახებ.

სარედაქციო კოლეჯია

ნათია დუნდუა (პასუხისმგებელი მდივანი), დარეჯან კლდიაშვილი, აპოლონ თაბუაშვილი, მაია მაჭავარიანი, ნინო მელიქიშვილი (მთავარი რედაქტორი), თამარ ოთხმეზური, მაია რაფავა, მზია სურგულაძე, დალი ჩიტუნაშვილი.

იოსტ გიპერტი (ჰამბურგის უნივერსიტეტი), ჰუბერტ კაუფჰოლდი (მიუნხენის ლუდვიგ მაქსიმილიანის უნივერსიტეტი), ბერნარ კული (ლუვენის კათოლიკური უნივერსიტეტი), ოლივერ რაისნერი (ილიას სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი), ბერნარ უტიე (სამეცნიერო კვლევის ფრანგული ნაციონალური ცენტრი), თინათინ ქრონცი (მაინცის გუტენბერგის სახელობის უნივერსიტეტი), გაგა შურღაია (ნეაპოლის უნივერსიტეტი “L’Orientale”), ნინო ცხომელიძე (ჯონს ჰოპკინზის უნივერსიტეტი).

ტომის რედაქტორები: მაია მაჭავარიანი, დარეჯან კლდიაშვილი.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dali Chitunashvili, Natia Dundua (executive secretary), Darejan Kldiashvili, Maia Matchavariani, Nino Melikishvili (editor-in-chief), Thamar Otkhmezuri, Maia Raphava, Mzia Surguladze, Apolon Tabuashvili.

Jost Gippert (Universität Hamburg), Hubert Kaufhold (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München), Bernard Coulie (Université Catholique de Louvain), Oliver Reisner (Iliia State University), Bernard Outtier (French National Centre for Scientific Research), Tinatin Chronz (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz), Gaga Shurghaia (University of Naples “L’Orientale”), Nino Zchomelidze (Johns Hopkins University).

Editors of the volume: Maia Matchavariani, Darejan Kldiashvili.

ISSN 0234-7385 („მრავალთავი“)

© კორნელი კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი, 2023

შინაარსი

ობარ ოთხმეზური	
ფიგურალური გამოთქმა – კანონი ილისტიკისა – ეგრემ მცირის თარგმანებში (არეოპაგიტული კორპუსი და გრიგოლ ღვთისმეტყველის ლიტურგიკულ საკითხავთა კრებული)	10
ნინო მელიქიშვილი	
წმ. ეფთვიმე ათონელის „ღვთისმშობლის ცხოვრების“ ქართული თარგმანის ბერძნული წყაროს შესახებ	26
ემვთიმე კოჭლამაზაშვილი	
ეფთვიმე მთაწმიდელის ერთი უცნობი თარგმანი	53
ნუზარ პაპუაშვილი	
ახალციხის მეჩეთი და მისი ბიბლიოთეკა პავლე სანკოვსკის სტატიის კვალდაკვალ	73
ლაშა ტყეშელაშვილი	
ევაგრე პონტოელის შრომათა ძველი ქართული თარგმანები (წინათონური) და მათ შორის ერთი უცნობი შეგონება „ცუდაღბუაობისათვის“	109
ოქრო ჯოჯო	
ძველი გაფაზის თავწმინდა გიორგის ეკლესიის 1026 წლის საღმრთოწმებლო წარწერა კახეთ-პერეთის მეფეების – კვირიკე III დიდისა და საჰლას მოხსენიებით	128
ცისანა ბიბილიაშვილი	
სახლი ბეთანიაში (ბარონ ალ. ნიკოლაის წერილების მიხედვით)	164
EKA KVIRKVELIA, MARIAM KAMARAULI	
A preliminary analysis of the Georgian Palimpsest Paris, BnF, géorg. 5 with Multispectral Imaging	175
WALKER R. THOMPSON	
Marian Hymnography in the Georgian Jerusalem Tropologion	205

მავდა მჟედლიძე

იოანე პეტრიწის ვრცელი ბიბლიოგრაფია 2021 წლამდე 233

ინფორმაცია

ქრონიკა 2022 257

ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრის 2022 წლის გამოცემები 263

IN MEMORIAM

ზაზა ალექსიძის გახსენება 271

ეთერ ქავთარაძე (1937-2023) 279

CONTENTS

THAMAR OTKHMEZURI	
Figurative Expression – A Rule of Ilistiki – in the Collection of Gregory the Theologian’s Liturgical Sermons and the Corpus Areopagiticus Translated by Ephrem Mtsire	10
NINO MELIKISHVILI	
On the Greek Source of the Georgian Translation of the “Life of the Virgin Mary” by St. Euthymius the Hagiorite (based on the research of Michel Van Esbroeck and Christos Simelidis)	26
EKVTIME KOCHLAMAZASHVILI	
A Previously Unknown Translation by Euthymius the Hagiorite	53
NUGZAR PAPUASHVILI	
Akhaltsikhe Mosque and Its Library: Following Pavel Sankovski’s Article	73
LASHA TKEBUCHAVA	
Old-Georgian (Pre-Athonite) Translations of the Works of Evagrius Ponticus and Among Them One Unknown Admonition “De Vana Gloria”	109
TEMO JOJUA	
The 1026-year-old Construction Inscription of the Church of St. George of Old Gavazi, Mentioning the Kings of Kakheti-Hereti – Kvirike III the Great and Sahla	128
TSISANA BIBILEISHVILI	
The House in Bethania (Based on the Letters of Baron Al. Nikolai)	164
EKA KVIRKVELIA, MARIAM KAMARAULI	
A preliminary analysis of the Georgian Palimpsest Paris, BnF, géorg. 5 with Multispectral Imaging	175
WALKER R. THOMPSON	
Marian Hymnography in the Georgian Jerusalem Tropologion	205
MAGDA MCHEDLIDZE	
An Extensive Bibliography of Ioane Petritsi up to 2021	233
INFORMATION	
Chronicle – 2022	257
Publications of the National Center of Manuscripts – 2022	263

IN MEMORIAM

Remembering Zaza Aleksidze
Eter Kavtaradze (1937-2023)

271

279

ხელნაწერთა ძირითადი საცავები საქართველოში

შემოკლებები

პიპმ	სერგი მაკალათიას სახელობის გორის ისტორიულ-ეთნოგრაფიული მუზეუმი
სცსპ	საქართველოს ცენტრალური სახელმწიფო არქივი (საქართველოს ეროვნული არქივი)
სიპმ	სვანეთის ისტორიულ-ეთნოგრაფიული მუზეუმი (საქართველოს ეროვნული მუზეუმი)
სპიმ	ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის სამცხე-ჯავახეთის ისტორიული მუზეუმი (საქართველოს ეროვნული მუზეუმი)
ქიპმ	ნიკო ბერძენიშვილის სახელობის ქუთაისის სახელმწიფო ისტორიულ-ეთნოგრაფიული მუზეუმი
ხმ	შალვა ამირანაშვილის სახელობის ხელოვნების ეროვნული მუზეუმი (საქართველოს ეროვნული მუზეუმი)
ხეც	ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი (ყოფილი კორნელი კეკელიძის სახელობის ხელნაწერთა ინსტიტუტი)
ზიამ	ზუგდიდის სახელმწიფო ისტორიულ-არქიტექტურული მუზეუმი
NCM	National Centre of Manuscripts

WALKER R. THOMPSON

MARIAN HYMNOGRAPHY IN THE GEORGIAN JERUSALEM TROPOLOGION

Background and State of Research

The Old Georgian Jerusalem Tropologion or ‘Oldest/Most Ancient Iadgari’ (Geo. უძველესი იადგარი, herein simply: Iadgari) is a rich and diverse miscellany of Georgian translated hymnography serving various liturgical functions, which goes back, at least in part, as far as the 6th century.¹ According to Renoux’s persuasive dating on the basis of Armenian and other sources, the original Greek versions of individual hymns in the collection, including those to the Virgin Mary, may date from the late 4th – early 5th centuries or before.² The Iadgari texts are preserved in manuscripts and fragments kept in St. Catherine’s Monastery in Sinai (hence one sometimes finds the alternative appellation ‘Sinai Iadgari’), and have been known to scholarship in some form since at least the late 19th century, albeit for a long time nearly exclusively in Georgia.³ The first critical edition of the Iadgari is that of Shanidze et al. (ჰილ-ეტრატიხ იადგარი) based on the manuscript Ms. CM H-2123 (9th c.). In 1980, Metreveli, Ch’ankievi and Khevsuriani at the National Centre of Manuscripts of Georgia published an authoritative critical edition of all known manuscript witnesses to the Georgian Iadgari tradition;⁴ this tremendous work of scholarship remains unsurpassed to this day.⁵ A full-text ver-

¹ Jeffrey, *The Earliest Christian Chant Repertory Recovered*, p. 14.

² Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection* I, pp. 52–54; Shoemaker, *Mary in Early Christian Faith*, 191–192; Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. xviii. Kujumdzieva (*The Hymnographic Book*, 42) proposes a later dating (8th c.) for the Iadgari, but her argumentation is less persuasive than that of Renoux, who approaches the topic with his deep knowledge of Armenian sources and other early Christian texts.

³ Khevsuriani, *Iadgari*, 2009; Wade, *The Oldest Iadgari*; Wade, *The Jerusalem Tropologion*.

Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი.

⁵ Chronz, Review of Renoux, p. 266.

sion of this edition with functioning keyword search has been made available on the TITUS Texts database at the University of Frankfurt.⁶

Since the early 2000s, the Most Ancient Iadgari has increasingly attracted the attention of scholars as one of the best sources for the old Jerusalem liturgy, among other things with respect to the hymns of the Sunday cycle⁷ and the Feasts of Encaenia and of the Exaltation of the Cross.⁸ There have been three significant partial editions and translations of the Iadgari texts in Western European languages: a French one of the hymns of the Resurrection in three volumes, by Renoux,⁹ a German one of Nativity hymns by Schneider¹⁰, and a parallel of Georgian-English one of Resurrectional and Marian hymns by Shoemaker.¹¹ Renoux and Shoemaker consciously adopt somewhat different editorial approaches from the 1980 edition, which is a composite of multiple manuscripts.¹²

These developments have spurred on research into the relationship between the hymnography in the Iadgari, as witnessing to the Old Jerusalem liturgy,¹³ and the liturgical books of the later Byzantine Greek (and Slavic) rite. The study of individual monostrophes from the Iadgari has, in this respect, generated some of the most interesting recent research on the textual history of the Oktoechos. In particular, the authors of the 1980 edition discovered eight *stichera anastasi-ma* common to the Iadgari and the medieval/modern Byzantine Oktoechos, with Zheltov subsequently expanding this list to 29.¹⁴ In their respective editions, Shoemaker and Renoux likewise identify many of these parallels, as well as the ancient Marian hymn *Sub tuum praesidium*, known from both the Christian West and the

⁶ “The Most Ancient Hymn-Book (უძველესი იადგარი)”, *TITUS Texts Database*, URL: <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/liturg/udzviad/udzvi.htm> (accessed 01.04.2022)

⁷ Frøyshov, *The Early Development*; Zheltov, *Stikhiry voskresnogo oktoikha*.

⁸ Permiakov, *Obnovlenie Khrama Voskreseniia*.

⁹ Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection I–III*.

¹⁰ Schneider, *Lobpreis im rechten Glauben*.

¹¹ Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*.

¹² Following Renoux, Shoemaker primarily reproduces the text of Mss. Sin. georg. 40, 41, and 34, while also filling in missing or incomplete strophes from other manuscripts. The Marian hymns in the First Mode in his edition come from Ms. Sin. georg. 34, while the remaining seven modes are taken from Sin. georg. 41.

¹³ On the significance of the Georgian witness to the Jerusalem liturgy, see Frøyshov, *The Georgian Witness*; Sakvarelidze, *Some Aspects of the Byzantinization*.

¹⁴ Zheltov, *Stikhiry voskresnogo oktoikha*, pp. 98–99.

Christian East and attested in a ca. 6th century papyrus from the John Rylands collection;¹⁵ in later Greek, Georgian, and Church Slavonic service books, this hymn is prescribed to be sung at the dismissal of Vespers.

Renoux, and Shoemaker after him, both note that the early 4th c. Archbishop Proclus of Constantinople, in his *Oratio I de laudibus s. Mariae*, quotes the Greek version of a further Marian hymn found in the Iadgari (incipit: შენ, ზეცისა წვმიხა წმიდისა...).¹⁶ This serves as an argument for dating this particular hymn back to at least the 4th century. However, as this parallel occurs in a homiletic rather than a hymnographical text, and predates the Oldest Iadgari, it does not fall within the scope of this study.

Newly Identified Hymns

Sub tuum praesidium is, as it happens, not the only Marian hymn from the Iadgari present in later Byzantine liturgical books. It proved possible to identify three further song-texts that have been preserved in the medieval Byzantine rite, and which, like *Sub tuum praesidium*, are of considerable liturgical significance. The incipits and references to the editions of the Old Georgian text are given here

(1) ვითარმედ გხადოდიო შენ, სახარულევანო [=Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი, p. 399, ll. 3–7; cf. Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. 302]

(2) ყოლად წმიდაო ღმრთისმშობელო [= Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი, 475, ll. 40–42; cf. Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. 316]

(3) ვინ არა გნატრის შენ, ყოლად წმიდაო ქალწულო [= Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი, p. 399, ll. 8–14; cf. Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. 306]

Text (1) is attested in the Greek Horologion from the medieval period (at the latest) as a *theotokion* at the First Hour, and is found in both Church Slavonic and Greek sources as part of the ‘ordinary’ of the service, i.e., it is chanted daily

¹⁵ Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. 315, fn. 12; cf. Smelova, *Biblical Allusions and Citations*, p. 124.

The dating of the papyrus to the 4th century given by Shoemaker (cf. Stegmüller, *Sub tuum praesidium*) is no longer widely accepted (Förster, *Zur ältesten Überlieferung*; Mihálykó, *The Christian Liturgical Papyri*, p. 353, fn. 220; cf. also Stegmüller, *Fragmente frühchristlicher Poesie*, p. 96, fn. 2). I am grateful to Dr. Tinatin Chronz for drawing my attention to this issue and providing these references.

¹⁶ Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. 313; Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection* II, 2010: p. 22; cf. PG 65:681b.

regardless of the current liturgical celebration.¹⁷ The full Old Georgian text reads as follows:

ვითარმედ გხადოდით შენ, სახარულევანო,
ცად, რამეთუ გამოაბრწყინე მზც სიმართლისაჲ,
სამოთხედ, რამეთუ გამოიღე ყოველი უკრწნელებისაჲ,
შევ და დაადგერ უკრწნელად წმიდად.
ქალწულმან იტვრთე მკლავთა ზედა ძც, ყოველთა ღმერთი,
მას ვევედრე ცხორებად სულთა ჩუენთათვს.¹⁸

*What shall we call Thee, O Thou Who art full of grace?¹⁹
Heaven, for Thou hast caused to shine forth the Sun of Righteousness?
Paradise, for Thou hast brought forth the [Blossom?] of incorruption?²⁰
Thou gavest birth and hast remained incorruptible and holy.
[As a] Virgin, Thou has carried upon Thine arms a Son [Who is] God of
all,
Supplicate Thou Him to save our souls.*

The standard contemporary Greek liturgical text from the Horologion is as follows:²¹

Τὶ σὲ καλέσωμεν, ὦ Κεχαριτωμένη;
Οὐρανόν, ὅτι ἀνέτειλας τὸν Ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης.
Παράδεισον, ὅτι ἐβλάστησας τὸ ἄνθος τῆς ἀφθορίας.
Παρθένον, ὅτι ἔμεινας ἀφθορος·
ἀγνήν Μητέρα, ὅτι ἔσχες σαῖς ἀγίαις ἀγκάλαις υἱόν, τὸν πάντων Θεόν.
Αὐτὸν ἰκέτευε, σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

¹⁷ Andreev, *The Order of the Hours*; Shchepetkin, Shchepetkin, *Chasoslov XIV veka*, 202; *Sutochnyi bogosluzhebnyi krug*, 28.

¹⁸ Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი, 399, ll. 3–7; Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, 302.

¹⁹ I prefer this translation of სახარულევანო (supported by Renoux) to Shoemaker's solution, 'Cause of Joy': as in the Greek and Slavic texts of this hymn, it is manifestly an allusion to Lk. 1:28.

²⁰ *lit.* 'the all [sic!] of incorruption' (ყოველი უკრწნელებისაჲ). The disjointed syntax (ყოველი 'all' does not govern the genitive) forces one to conclude that ყოველი is scribal error (or misprint) for ყოვილი, a variant of ყუავილი 'bloom', 'blossom', as supported both by the context and Greek ἄνθος.

²¹ All Greek liturgical texts, unless otherwise noted, are taken from the online project *Ελληνικά Λειτουργικά Κείμενα*, URL: <https://glt.goarch.org> (accessed 01.04.2022).

*What shall we call Thee, O Thou Who art full of grace?
 Heaven, for Thou hast shone forth the Sun of Righteousness?
 Paradise, for Thou hast sprouted forth the Blossom of incorruption?
 Virgin, for Thou hast remained incorrupt?
 Pure Mother, for Thou hast carried upon Thine arms a Son [Who is] God
 of all,
 Supplicate Thou Him to save our souls.*

While this is evidently one and the same text, there are two notable differences from the Iadgari version. First, the parallelism of the fourth and fifth lines/units of meaning (*Sinnabschnitte*) in the Greek, signaled by the anaphora of accusative (duplex) + *ὅτι*, is missing from the Old Georgian in these two lines. Second, the concept of ‘Virgin’ is present not in the fourth line, but in the fifth, in place of ‘Holy Mother’. This suggests that the text was either distorted in translation, or the original Greek differed from more recent liturgical versions. The picture is complicated rather by an archaic Slavic witness, NLR Q.п.I.57, a Horologion that Andreev, in his recent comprehensive study on the topic, describes as ‘Slavonic Studite’ (Type IV in his classification).²² The text of the *theotokion* in this manuscript (f. 56r) is as follows:

Что тѣ наречемъ ѿбравованага·
 нѣо ли ꙗко въсияла ꙗси слнѣце правдыноѣ·
 рай ли ꙗко въздрастила ꙗси цвѣтъ неовладящій·
 мѣръ ли нѣ съхраниса непорочьнага чѣта·
 дѣвоу ли нѣ ѿмѣла ꙗси въ роукоу сѣа ѿ всѣхъ ба·
 тогò моли ѿ спснии дшѣ нашихъ.²³

*What shall we call Thee, O Thou Who art full of grace?
 Heaven, for Thou hast caused to shine forth the Sun of Righteousness?
 Paradise, for Thou hast caused to sprout up the Blossom of incorruption?
 Mother, yet Thou hast remained incorruptible and holy.
 Virgin, yet Thou hast carried upon Thine arms a Son [Who is] God of all.
 Pray thou Him to save our souls.*

²² Andreev, *The Order of the Hours*, 335.

²³ Nearly all East Slavic manuscripts of comparable antiquity concur broadly with this witness, despite minor orthographical or morphological divergences. I am grateful to Prof. Aleksei Pentkovskii for sending me a portion of an unpublished critical edition of the Horologion Q.п.I.57 on which basis I was able to confirm this.

Through repetition of the interrogative particle *ли*, the parallelism of the Greek is preserved to a greater extent than in the Old Georgian version. However, the concepts of ‘Mother’ (*მწიგნ*, corresponding to the finite verb-form *შევ*) and ‘Virgin’ (*დეხეი*, = ქალწულმან) follow the same order as in the Old Georgian text of the Iadgari. Moreover, it is impossible not to note the difference from the Greek syntax in the fourth and fifth clauses especially. The adjective *ἄγνη* [= *ἀγνή*], in the nominative, is kept together with *νεποροχνηδα* rather than agreeing with *δεβοι* – very similarly to *წმიდად* in the Georgian. This, and the reversal of ‘Mother’/‘Virgin’, necessitate the use of the contrasting conjunction *нъ* in order to preserve the logic and sense of the text.

There are two possible explanations for this discrepancy between the Greek (and other more recent liturgical sources) and both the Iadgari and the Old East Slavic Horologion. The first is that the Greek vorlage of both the Old Georgian and the early Slavic versions differed from the modern liturgical text. As noted by Andreev, liturgical usage in the Byzantine periphery (Southern Italian Greek, Georgian, and Palestinian Syriac) often “reflect[s] unusual or archaic usage that remains unattested in sources from the cultural center”.²⁴ One may doubt this possibility on account of the very clear parallel structure in the Greek; however, one cannot overlook the commonalities in these two translations separated by over six centuries.

The other possibility is that both the Old Georgian and Slavic translators misread **ἀγνην* as **ἀγνη* (in Thomson’s typology of translation errors, a compound of loss of letters and misrelation of adjectives).²⁵ In either case, in the case of both the Georgian and Church Slavonic texts, there is a clear shift towards literalism in the newer translations that will be observed in other *theotokia* as well. Meanwhile, the modern Georgian liturgical version, belonging to the group of texts revised according to Greek models in the 18th – 19th centuries,²⁶ has evidently been revised to match the Greek almost exactly:

რაჲ-მე სახელ-გდვათ შენ, ჟ მიმადლებულო?
 ცად, რამეთუ აღმოუბრწყინვე სოფელსა მზს სიმართლისაჲ,
 სამოთხედ, რამეთუ აღმოუცენე ყუავილი უხრწნელებისა,
 ქალწულად, რამეთუ დაადგერ უწრწნელად?
 წმიდად დედად, რამეთუ იტვირთე წმიდათა წიაღთა ძს და ყოველთა

²⁴ Andreev, *The Order of the Hours*, p. 319.

²⁵ Thomson, *Towards a typology of errors*, pp. 361/372–3.

²⁶ cf. Gugushvili, *Bogosluzhenie GPTs*.

ღმერთი,
მას ევედრე ცხორებად სულთა ჩუენთათჳს.²⁷

Compare this with the modern (Russian Synodal) Church Slavonic text:

**ЧТО ТЯ НАРЕЧЕМЪ, ѿ БЛГОДАТНАА;
НБѦ, ꙗкѡ ВОЗСТІАЛА ѢСН СЛНЦЕ ПРАВДЫ:
РАЙ , ꙗкѡ ПРОЗАБЛА ѢСН ЦВѢТЪ НЕТАЛѢНІА:
ДѢШ, ꙗкѡ ПРЕБЫЛА ѢСН НЕТАЛѢННА:
ЧИСТЮ МТРЬ, ꙗкѡ ИМѢЛА ѢСН НА СТЫХЪ ТВОИХЪ УБѢАТІАХЪ СНА, ВСѢХЪ
БГА.
ТОГО МОЛИ СПСТІСА ДШАМЪ НАШЫМЪ.²⁸**

The liturgical importance of this piece of hymnography, in light of its function as a fixed text at the First Hour, cannot be doubted. As confirmation of this, let it suffice to note that there is a special 17th Russian century icon of the Mother of God titled “Что ты наречемъ” after the incipit of this *theotokion*. In the icon, the Theotokos is depicted in the various aspects in which She is described in the hymn, making the icon a visual representation of the same.²⁹

* * *

A second Marian hymn present in the Iadgari that was inherited by the later Byzantine rite is the following:

ყოლად წმიდაო ღმრთისმშობელო, დღეთა ცხორებისა ჩუენისათა ნუ დამაგდებ მე, კაცობრივსა განზრახვასა ნუ მიმანდობ, არამედ შენ შეგვწყალებ და გუაცხოვნენ ჩუენ.³⁰

O All-Holy Mother of God, forsake me not in the days of my life, entrust me not to the intention of men, but do Thou Thyself have mercy on us and save us.

Two of its subsequent specific liturgical uses are at Great Compline, as a monostrophe after the responsory *Κύριε τῶν δυνάμεων...*, as well as in the service

²⁷ This text is cited from an unattributed digital version of the text of the hour of Prime from the contemporary Georgian Orthodox church context.

²⁸ Часослѡвъ, f. 49v.

²⁹ “Chto tia narechem” [“What shall we call Thee?”]. *Ikonoġrafiia vostochno-christianskogo iskusstva* [Iconography of Eastern Christian Art]. Project of the Department of Church Arts, Saint Tikhon’s Orthodox University of the Humanities, URL: <https://icons.pstgu.ru/icon/3592> (accessed 21.03.2022).

³⁰ Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი, 475, ll. 40–41; Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. 316.

of commemoration (*Панихида/Μνημόσυνον/ἱερόθεο*) as a Sessional Hymn after the Third Ode of the Canon (both in the Sixth Tone). In the latter function, it is attested in Old East Slavic horologion manuscripts, e.g. the 15th century Ms. Moscow RGB 113/349 (ff. 127r–v):

Всесѣла бѣе, во время живота моего не остави мене. въ члчвстїи помощи не оубѣри мене. но сама ма заступи и помилуй ма.

O All-Holy Mother of God, forsake me not during the time of my life, entrust me not to the help of men, but do Thou Thyself help me and have mercy on me.

For comparison, the contemporary Greek liturgical text from the Horologion is as follows:

Παναγία Θεοτόκε, τὸν χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς μου μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης με, ἀνθρωπίνῃ προστασίᾳ μὴ καταπιστεύσης με, ἀλλ' αὐτὴ ἀντιλαβοῦ, καὶ ἐλέησόν με.

As can be seen here, the Greek text and the Old Georgian and Church Slavonic translations show a great degree of similarity amongst themselves. The most noteworthy divergence is in the final phrase, which in the Old Georgian version has both a plural object ('us', *შეგვწყალებ... ჩვენ*) and different verbs ('have mercy' and 'save', versus 'help' and 'have mercy').

As in the case of the previous hymn, the modern (Russian) Church Slavonic and Georgian liturgical texts have been brought into line with the Greek:

ყოვლად-წმიდაო ღმრთისმშობელო, დღეთა ცხორებისა ჩემისათა ნუ დამავებ, და კაცობრივსა განზრახვასა ნუ მიმანდობ, არამედ შენ მეობ-მეყავ და მაცხოვრე მე.³¹

Всесѣла бѣе, во время живота моего не остави менѣ, челоѳеческомѣ предстательствѣ не вѣри ма: но сама заступи, ѡ помилуй ма.³²

While there are revisions that make them closer to the Greek (both syntactically, e.g. the shift from plural to singular object in the final phrase in the Georgian, and lexically, e.g. *члчвстїи помощи* → *челоѳеческомѣ предстательствѣ* in the Church Slavonic), these are less dramatic overall than in the case of the *theotokion* at the First Hour. Moreover, the degree of continuity between the two Georgian versions is particularly striking. Among other things, where Greek and Church Slavonic have the verb 'mercy' in the final phrase, both Georgian renditions have 'save' (*მაცხოვრე, გუაცხოვრენ*). It would not be unreasonable to assume that the middle/modern Georgian text of this hymn is descended from the Old Georgian one in the Iadgari.

³¹ The source of this text is likewise an anonymous PDF of unclear origin.

³² Часослѡвь, f. 116r.

Chalcedonian Piety and *Theotokia Dogmatika*

The third and final Marian hymn from the Iadgari that interests us here is arguably the most important. The full Old Georgian text is reproduced here:

ვინ არა გნატრის შენ, ყოლად წმიდაო ქალწულო,	<i>Who shall not call Thee blessed, Most Holy Virgin,</i>
ვინ არა უვალობს შენგან უკრწნელსა შიბასა?	<i>Who shall not hymn the most pure birth from Thee?</i>
რამეთუ რომელი-იგი უუამოჲ მამისაგან გამობრწყინდა	<i>For He who timelessly shone forth from the Father</i>
გამოუთქმელად ჳორცითა.	<i>Ineffably in the flesh,</i>
ბუნებით ღმერთი იყო	<i>He was God by nature</i>
და ბუნებით კაც იქმნა ჩუენთვის,	<i>and by nature he became man for our sake,</i>
არა ორად პირად განყოფილ,	<i>not divided into two persons,</i>
არამედ ორთაგან ბუნებათა	<i>but in two natures</i>
შეურევნელად ერთ ხატად იცნობების.	<i>is He known in one aspect without confusion.</i>
მას ვედრე, შემკულო, ყოლად ხანატრელო,	<i>Supplicate Him, O most pure and blessed One,</i>
ცხორებად სულთა ჩუენთათვის. ³³	<i>To save our souls.</i>

Renoux and Shoemaker both already noted the historical and dogmatic significance of this hymn in their works on the Iadgari and Marian piety. In particular, both scholars remark that შეურევნელად is the standard Old Georgian translation of Grk. *ἀσύγχυτως* ‘without confusion’, a technical term from the diophysite Chalcedonian Definition (or ‘Oros’) of 451. Moreover, Renoux also – rightly – takes ხატი [= *μορφή/ბერაძვ, ვრატკ*; cf. Ph. 2:6–7] and ჰირი³⁴ [= *πρόσωπον/лице*; cf. Mt. 6:18–17] as also being items of technical Christological vocabulary, and notes the occurrence of other such terms elsewhere in the Iadgari (for example, უქცეველად [= *ἀτρέπτως*, likewise found in the Chalcedonian Oros], in a Resurrectional hymn of the 3rd Plagal Tone).³⁵ To this one might also add ბუნება [= *φύσις/естество*] as another unambiguously Christological lexical item.

The occurrence of this Christological terminology causes Renoux to doubt his own dating of the originals of the Iadgari hymns to the late 4th–early 5th cc., a dating amply supported by other evidence in the manuscript and, as mentioned above, Armenian parallels.³⁶ Shoemaker, for his part, does not regard this as a problem, stating that the use of the term *ἀσύγχυτως/ἀσύγχυτως* “to describe the

³³ Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი, p. 399, ll. 8–14; Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. 306.

³⁴ In the footnote to Renoux’s translation, misspelled as ფირი, presumably as the result of a typographical error.

³⁵ Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection* II, p. 285, fn. 8.

³⁶ Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection* II, p. 22.

union of natures in Christ was not the Fourth Council’s invention, and there is significant precedent for such usage in writers of the fourth and early fifth centuries”.³⁷ On the contrary, he finds support in the dogmatic terminology of this hymn for his overall theory about the sophistication of early Christian language and imagery about the Mother of God.³⁸

One could thus be led to believe that this ‘Chalcedonian’ hymn might even predate the Fourth Council, were it not for one crucial piece of information that leads us much closer to an understanding of the relationship between the two: this hymn does not only occur in the Georgian Iadgari, but rather is very well known in the Greek, Syriac, Slavic, and subsequent Georgian traditions as the so-called *theotokion dogmatikon* of the Second Plagal Mode, in the Oktoechos among other liturgical books. The earliest known Greek versions are preserved (without the explicit title *dogmatikon*) in 9th-11th century Sticherarion (or Stichero-kathismatarion) and Oktoechos manuscripts, such as Cod. Athos Laura Γ.67 (f. 131v),³⁹ Sinait. gr. 1593 (f. 66r), and Sinait. gr. 778 (f. 38r).⁴⁰ The text from the 19th c. *Παρακλητική* is reproduced here:

Τίς μὴ μακαρίσει σε, Παναγία Παρθένε;	<i>Who shall not call Thee blessed, Most Holy Virgin,</i>
τίς μὴ ἀνυμνήσει σου τὸν ἀλόχευτον τόκον;	<i>Who shall not sing the praises of Thine immaculate child-bearing,</i>
ὁ γὰρ ἀχρόνως ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκλάμψας	<i>For the only-begotten Son, having shone forth timelessly from</i>
Υἱὸς μονογενῆς	<i>the Father</i>
ὁ αὐτὸς ἐκ σοῦ τῆς Ἀγνῆς προῆλθεν,	<i>Himself came forth from Thee, the Pure One,</i>
ἀφράστως σαρκωθεῖς,	<i>having been ineffably made flesh,</i>
φύσει Θεὸς ὑπάρχων,	<i>being God by nature,</i>
καὶ φύσει γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος δι’ ἡμᾶς,	<i>and becoming Man by nature for our sake,</i>
οὐκ εἰς δυάδα προσώπων τεμνόμενος,	<i>not divided into a duality of persons,</i>
ἀλλ’ ἐν δυάδι φύσεων,	<i>but in a duality of natures,</i>
ἀσυγχύτως γνωριζόμενος.	<i>known without confusion.</i>
Αὐτὸν ἱκέτευε, σεμνὴ Παμμακάριστε,	<i>Supplicate Him, Pure and Most Blessed One,</i>
ἐλεηθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν. ⁴¹	<i>to have mercy on our souls.</i>

³⁷ Shoemaker, *Mary in Early Christian Faith*, p. 191.

³⁸ Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. xxiii.

³⁹ Hannick, *The Theotokos in Byzantine hymnography*, p. 72, fn. 17. This codex is a miscellany comprising a Tridion, Pentekostarion, and Oktoechos.

⁴⁰ Smelova, *Melkite Syriac Hymns*, p. 127.

⁴¹ *ibid*, Smelova, *Melkite Syriac Hymns*, p. 127.

The Greek has remained remarkably stable through time: Cod. Laura Γ.67 evinces virtually no variant readings vis-à-vis the modern liturgical version, with the sole exception that the adjectives *ἄχρονος* and *ἀσύγχυτος* are found in place of the (homophonous) adverbs *ἀσυγχύτως* and *ἀχρόνως*.

In late medieval and modern Oktoechoi following the neo-Sabbaitic liturgical Typikon, this *theotokion dogmatikon* is prescribed as a *sticheron* at Sunday Vespers, at the end of the lucernarium, immediately before the entrance of the clergy into the altar with the censer – a solemn moment in the service that underscores the hymn’s liturgical and theological import. Meanwhile, the *dogmatika* generally are absent from archaic Slavic Oktoechos manuscripts, such as Ms. Sof. 123. Indeed, many early Greek Oktoechoi do not even have a separate category of *theotokia* at all.⁴² In other early manuscripts in which it is included, such as Athos Laura Γ.67 or the mid-14th century East Slavic Ms. Moscow RGADA 381.1/75 (an *izbornyi oktoikh* or ‘select Oktoechos’), it is merely given as a ‘*theotokion*’ alongside several others, without its liturgical function being specified further. The RGADA manuscript contains a Church Slavonic translation that is identifiably quite old, owing such linguistic features as the rendering of *μονογενῆς* as *ѦДИНОЧАДЪ* (ff. 29v–30r):

КТО ТЕБЕ НЕ БЛЖИТЬ ПРЕСТАПА ДВО БЦЕ
 КТО ЛИ НЕ ПОЮТЬ ТВОЮ [sic!] ЧТѦГО РЖТВА
 БЕЗЛѦТНЫ ОУБО ѿ ФЦА ВОСИПЕВЪ СНЪ ѦДИНОЧАДЪ
 ТОЖЕ И ѿ ТЕБЕ ПРЧТѦПА ПРДИЕ
 НЕИЗРЕЧЕННО ВОПЛОЩЕСА:
 ѦСТЬСТВОМЪ [sic!] БЪ СЫ
 И ѦСТЬСТВО[МЪ] ЧЛѦКЪ БЫВЪ НА РА
 НЕ ВО ДВОИЦИ РАЗДѦЛѦЕМЪ
 НО ВЪ ДВОИЦИ ѦСТЬСТВОМЪ
 НЕСМѦСНО СЛАВИМЪ.
 ТОГО МОЛИ ЧТѦПА ПРЕЖЖНАПА
 СПѦТИСА ДШМЪ НА. ∴

The text is corrupted in several places, apparently due to scribal errors (omissions and haplographies), but as in the Georgian, there are a few places in which it clearly diverges from the Greek: the addition of *бцѣ* in the first line, the omission of *лицъ in the phrase *не во двоици раздѣлѦемъ*, and the translation of

⁴² Bulaev, *Zhanrovyyi sostav*, p. 35.

γνωριζόμενος as славимъ and ἐλεθῆναι as спѣтисѧ (both σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν and ἐλεθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν are common liturgical formulae or *akroteleutia*,⁴³ perhaps leading to conflation here). The adjective БЕЗЛАѢТНЫ (instead of the expected adverb *БЕЗЛАѢТНО) may be explained in terms of the variant reading ἀχρονος found in Cod. Laura Γ.67 (cf. ηἰσθῶσ in the Iadgari text – the adjectival form may thus in fact be older than the adverbial).

By contrast, in Moscow RGB Ms. 256/288 (f. 71v), a 15th c. Oktoechos with determinedly South Slavic orthography, not only does this *theotokion* have pride of place as the last hymn of the lucernarium for Tone VI Saturday evening (i.e. Sunday) Vespers, but the translation is syntactically and lexically closer to the original Greek and has been revised vis-à-vis the older East Slavic version quoted above. Interestingly, the theological term ἀσυχύτως has been rendered using a different root, as несъліанно rather than несмѣсно:

КѢО ТѢБЕ НЕ БЛЖИТЬ ПРѢТА ДѢО
 ЛИ КѢО НЕ ВЪСПОѢ ТВОЕГѠ ПРѢТАГО РОЖЬСТВА.
 БЕЗЛАѢНО БО Ѡ ОЦА ВЪСІАВЪ СІЬ ЄДИНОРОДНИИ.
 ТЪЖДЕ Ѡ ТѢБЕ ЧѢТМА ПРОІДЕ
 НЕСКАЗАННО ВЪПЛЪЩСА.
 ЁСТВѠ БЪ СІИ.
 И ЁСТВОМЪ БЫВЪ ЧЛКЪ НА РАДИ.
 НЕ ВЪ ДВѢ ЛИЦИ РАЗДѢЛѢѢ.
 НЖ ВЪ ДВОИЦИ ЁСТВЪВЪ
 НЕСЪЛІАННО ПОЗНАВѢЕМЪ
 ТОГО МЛИ ЧѢТА И ВЪСѢБЛЖЕНА.
 ПОМЛОВАТИСА ДША НАШИ.

The modern (Russian Synodal) Church Slavonic translation is quite comparable with the medieval version quoted above in its literalism (with the minor nuance that the parallel construction не во двою...но во двою... is a greater departure from the Greek; in the earlier versions, the numeral двоица corresponds to Greek δυάς).

КѢО ТЕБѢ НЕ ОУБЛЖИТЬ ПРѢСТА ДѢО;
 КѢО ЛИ НЕ ВОСПОѢТЪ ТВОЕГѠ ПРѢТАГѠ РЖТВА;
 БЕЗЛАѢТНѠ БО Ѡ ОЦА ВОЗСІАВЫИ СІЬ ЄДИНОРОДНИИ,

⁴³ For discussion of this term in historical context, see Conomos, *What is a Troparion?*.

ТО́ЙЖЕ ѿ ТЕБѢ ЧѢ́ТЫА прѠ́ЙДЕ,
 НЕИЗРЕЧѢ́ННА ВОПЛО́ЩЬСЯ,
 Ё́СТЕСТВѠ́МЪ БГ҃Ъ СЫ́Й,
 ꙗ́ Ё́СТЕСТВѠ́МЪ БЫ́ВЪ ЧЛ҃ВѢ́КЪ НА́СЪ РА́ДИ,
 НЕ ВО ДВОѠ́ ЛИЦѢ́ РАЗДѢ́ЛА́ЕМЫЙ,
 НО ВО ДВОѠ́ Ё́СТЕСТВѢ́
 НЕСЛІ́ТНУ ПОЗНАВѢ́ЕМЫЙ.
 ТОГѠ́ МОЛІ́ ЧѢ́ТАА, ВСЕБЛ҃ЖѢ́ННАА,
 ПОМІ́ЛОВАТИСЯ ДУ́ША́МЪ НА́ШЫМЪ.⁴⁴

Meanwhile, the contemporary Georgian liturgical text of the *dogmatikon*, while bearing obvious lexical and terminological similarities to that in the Iadgari, has itself been revised considerably so as to be a more literal translation of the Greek. Notably, the formerly ‘missing’ lines ‘Only-begotten Son, the Same came forth from Thee, Most Pure One’ (ძმ მხოლოდშობილი / იგივე შენგან უბიწოდა გამოვიდა) have been added in:

ვინ არა გნატრიდეს შენ, ყოვლადწმიდაო ქალწულო,
 ვინ არა უგალობდეს უკრწნელსა შობასა შენსა,
 რამეთუ რომელი-იგი უჟამოდ მამისაგან გამობრწყინდა ძმ
 მხოლოდშობილი,
 იგივე შენგან უბიწოდა გამოვიდა
 გამოუთქმელად ჯორცშესხმული,
 ღმერთი იყო ბუნებით
 და ჩვენთვის კაც-იქმნა წყალობით.
 არა ორებად პირთასა განიკვეთა,
 არამედ ორითა ბუნებით
 შეურევნელად საცნაურ-იქმნა.
 მას ევედრე, პატიოსანო და ყოვლადსანატრელო,
 ცხორებისათვის სულთა ჩვენთასა.⁴⁵

Notably, this revised Georgian text is still *less* literal than its Church Slavonic counterparts. Where the Georgian makes use of finite verbs (გამობრწყინდა, იყო,

⁴⁴ Ὁκτῶν, f. 88v.

⁴⁵ კვირის ღამისთევის მსახურებები პარაკლიტონის (რვა ხმა) მიხედვით [Sunday Vigil Services According to the Paraklitikē (Eight Tones)], p. 66. The edition is in *khutsuri* script but the text is provided here in *mkhedruli* for convenience and in conformity with Georgian academic practice.

[კაც-/საცნაჲ-]ოქმნა, განოვეთა) in subordinate or indeed main clauses to convey Greek participles, Church Slavonic faithfully replicates the original constructions. The inherent structural differences between the two languages are surely a factor in this: Church Slavonic possesses a larger set of participles than (Old) Georgian. We will see this again when looking at the Syriac versions (below).

The perception of the liturgical import of this and other texts dubbed *dogmatiki* in the Slavic tradition only grew over time, with the chant melodies composed for them being more elaborate than for other *stichera* in the Oktoechos.⁴⁶ We can thus observe a clear evolution in the liturgical function of this text over time, from being one *theotokion* among many in the Oldest Iadgari, to being included as one of several under a particular tone in the Oktoechos, and finally to being assigned a very particular liturgical place and function. This might be regarded in the overall framework of what Hannick termed, with respect to the formation of the Oktoechos, an evolution from ‘recueils génériques’ to ‘recueils liturgiques’.⁴⁷

As becomes especially clear when looking at the Greek text of this hymn (which can be presumed close to the original of the Iadgari translation), it is not only the terminology, but also the content and structure of this text that echo the Chalcedonian Oros (or ‘Definition’). Let us look at the relevant passage in the Oros itself:

... **πρὸ αἰώνων** μὲν **ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς** γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, υἱόν, κύριον, **μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον... οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον...**⁴⁸

... *before the ages begotten of the Father as to the Godhead, but in the last days, the Self-same, for us and for our salvation (born) of Mary the Virgin Theotokos as to the Manhood; One and the Same Christ, Son, Lord, **Only-begotten;***

⁴⁶ Gardner, *Altrussischer notierter Oktoich*, p. 222, fn. 9.

⁴⁷ Hannick, *Le texte de l’Oktoechos*, p. 41; cf. Bulaev, *Zhanrovvi sostav*, 34. By ‘recueils génériques’, Hannick understands specifically collections of texts belonging to the same hymnographical *genre* (Sticherarion, Kontakarion, etc.). However, one could also extend the concept to apply to groupings of hymnographical works according to either *genre* and *thematic content*, or both. While the Iadgari is itself already partially organized along ‘liturgical’ lines, some sections of the manuscripts, such as those containing the Marian hymns examined here, are still evidently structured entirely around the content of the texts, grouped thematically.

⁴⁸ quoted in Wickham, *Chalkedon*.

*acknowledged in Two Natures unconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably...not as though He was parted or divided into Two Persons...*⁴⁹

Even if the order of the corresponding parts is not identical between the two texts, the high degree of overlap (especially in the bold-faced segments) is obvious. This is especially true on a syntactical level, as in the emphatically similar use of the participle *γνωρίζόμενος* (-v) in the two texts. Unless the Chalcedonian Oros was quoting the hymn (!), everything therefore points to this being an explicit reference to the former in the latter. Still, this does not have to be a problem in itself in dating of these texts: the Iadgari and its lost Greek prototype(s) can be understood as hymnographic anthologies or miscellanies bringing together hymns from various periods, from the 3rd century (or earlier) down to the 5th century.

The discovery of the text of this *theotokion dogmatikon* in the Iadgari makes it necessary to revise certain conceptions and claims about the *dogmatika* as a whole. The hymns of this (sub-)genre have traditionally been ascribed to St. John of Damascus, as in the following encyclopedia entry by Zheltov:

Традиция приписывает создание Д[огматиков] прп. Иоанну Дамаскину (VIII в.). Действительно, в древнейших сохранившихся (преимущественно в груз. переводе) редакциях иерусалимских сборников воскресных песнопений, восходящих к IV–V вв., Д[огматики] отсутствуют, тогда как в рукописях IX в. (напр., Sinait. gr. 1593) большинство из них уже есть; поэтический стиль и особенности построения мн[огих] Д[огматиков] также сопоставимы с др[угими] творениями прп. Иоанна, напр. стихирами в чине отпевания. Впрочем, корпус Д[огматиков] (включая Д[огматики] малой вечерни) в рукописях не вполне стабилен [...] и окончательно сложился не сразу.⁵⁰

Tradition attributes the creation of the dogmatika to St. John of Damscus (8th c.). Indeed, in the oldest surviving redactions of the Jerusalem anthologies of Sunday hymns (mostly Georgian translations), which go back to the 4th–5th centuries, the dogmatika are absent, whereas in 9th century manuscripts (e.g., Sinait. gr. 1593), the majority of them already there. The poetic style and particular features of the construction of many dogmatika are also comparable with other works by St. John, for example, the stichera from the funeral service. Moreover, the corpus of dogmatika (including those at Small Vespers) is not entirely stable [...] and did not take shape immediately.

Similarly, Hannick writes:

⁴⁹ trans. Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents*, p. 297

⁵⁰ Zheltov, *Dogmatik*.

The *dogmatika theotokia* are considered to be the work of John of Damascus, an attribution which, linguistically speaking, is supported by their use of unusual expressions such as ‘αὐθυπάρκτως’ (existent in itself) in the *theotokion* of the *tonus gravis*: ‘Φρικτὸν καὶ ἄρρητον ὄντως’ (terrible and inexpressible indeed) – an expression which is used only by authors of the 7th to 8th centuries, such as Anastasios of Sinai, Leontios of Jerusalem or John of Damascus.⁵¹

In her musicological thesis on the Slavonic Oktoechos, Pletneva likewise claims Damascene authorship not only for the *dogmatika*, but also for the *stichera anastasima* – even though Metreveli’s and Renoux’s editions of the Sunday hymns from the Iadgari had already proven otherwise.⁵² Similar statements, including ones referring explicitly to Zheltov, can also be found with some degree of frequency in modern Russian church-popular media.⁵³ However, treating the *theotokia dogmatika* as a cohesive collection is nothing new and there even exist entire Old East Slavic commentaries specifically on the *dogmatika* in the eight tones.⁵⁴ In addition, it was possible to identify the Slavonic text not only of **Κτὸ τεβὲ νε οὐβλζήιτς...** [= *Τίς μὴ μακαρίσει σε...*], but also of the Tone 7 Theotokion Dogmatikon **Мати ѹбо позналасѧ ѣси...** [= *Μήτηρ μὲν ἐγνώσθης...*, cf. below] on scrolls held by Cosmas of Maiuma and John of Damascus, respectively, on a Russian icon from the turn of the 18th century from the collections of the Icon Museum in Recklinghausen, Germany. The appearance of the texts on these scrolls represents a *de facto* attribution of the respective texts to these two saints.

⁵¹ Hannick, *The Theotokos in Byzantine hymnography*, p. 72.

⁵² Pletneva, *Pevcheskaia kniga «Oktoikh»*, p. 4.

⁵³ E.g.: “«Кто Тебе не ублажит, Пресвиатаиа Дево?». Комментарий к догматикѹ шестого гласа” [“Who shall not call Thee blessed, O Most Holy Virgin?’ Commentary on the Dogmatikon of the Sixth Tone”]. *Pravoslavie.ru*. <https://pravoslavie.ru/144041.html> (accessed 01.04.2022); “Dogmatik shestogo glasa” [“The Dogmatikon in the Sixth Tone”]. *Radio Vera*. <https://radiovera.ru/dogmatik-shestogo-glasa.html> (accessed 01.04.2022).

⁵⁴ For an edition of one such commentary, see Vershinin, *Drevnerusskoe tolkovanie*.

FIGURE 1



FIGURE 2



Ikonen-Museum Recklinghausen, 920 (acquired 1990), *O tebē raduetsia vsiakaia tvaru* Russia (armory), ca. 1700, egg tempera on wood, 174.5×156.5 cm (used with permission)

It is obvious that the traditional attribution of these texts must now be revised, for we have already ascertained that one of the eight “major” *dogmatika* is in fact present in the selfsame collections of Old Georgian hymns in which Zheltov claims they do not exist. Following Renoux’s dating of the Marian hymns in the Iadgari, the translation of the hymn would have been carried out the 6th century. This substantial back-dating allows us to state with confidence that John of Damascus was definitely not its author. While some of the *dogmatika* may still have been written by St. John, it is likely that his real achievement was in compiling the ‘corpus’ of these hymns from pre-existing sources or collections of *theotokia*. In other words, the hymns did not originally form a ‘category in themselves’,⁵⁵ nor were they composed as part of an eight-tone cycle, but instead they later came to be viewed as a single corpus as the result of a process of compilation or anthologization (by John of Damascus and others).

Two further observations speak in favour of treating the *dogmatika* as disparate hymns rather than a cohesive body of texts. First, *Τίς μὴ μακαρίσει σε...* is

⁵⁵ Hannick, *The Theotokos in Byzantine hymnography*, p. 72.

not the only hymn from this group to occur outside of the Oktoechos and independently of the others: in a 9th/10th collection of Melkite Syriac translated hymnography, one finds, alongside this same text (see below), a version of what is now known as the *theotokion dogmatikon* of the Seventh (i.e. Third Plagal) Mode (Syriac incipit: ܠܗܘܐ ܘܠܗܘܐ ܘܠܗܘܐ ܘܠܗܘܐ ܘܠܗܘܐ ܘܠܗܘܐ ܘܠܗܘܐ ܘܠܗܘܐ [= *Mήτηρ μὲν ἐγνώσθης, ὑπὲρ φύσιν Θεοτόκε...*]).⁵⁶ Second, in all Greek and Slavic as well as Melkite Syriac witnesses, this hymn is placed under the Sixth (Second Plagal) Mode; by contrast, in the Most Ancient Iadgari, it is included under the (non-plagal) Second Mode. Incidentally, specifically West Syriac (as opposed to Melkite) manuscripts containing this text concur with the Iadgari on the count, placing the hymn under the Second Mode, as does the early Saint Petersburg manuscript of *theotokia* examined by Smelova – a fact that in and of itself ought of considerable interest for musicologists. If, on the contrary, the hymn had originally been specially written by St. John of Damascus in the Sixth (Second Plagal) Mode as part of a cycle of *dogmatika* for the Oktoechos, one would not expect this alternation between the tones in different traditions.

The textual history of the *dogmatikon* in Syriac turns out to be no less interesting from the point of view of both translation technique and dogmatic understanding. The Slavic and Georgian texts reproduced above exhibit the same shift from lesser to greater literalism observed elsewhere, and also replicate the hymn's Christological terminology. The dogmatic awareness demonstrated in them extends to Syriac translations, too, including those examined by Smelova. These are much looser than any of the Georgian or Slavic versions. One redaction of the text is preserved in 11th–13th century Oktoechos manuscripts, including Brit. Lib. Add. 17133, Brit. Lib. Add. 14710, Sinait. syr. 25, Sinait. syr. 208 and Sinait. syr. 210, and St. Petersburg RNB Syr. new series 11. The text uses unambiguously Christological terms, including ܘܠܗܘܐ 'nature' and the Greek loanword ܐܝܘܣܘܦܘܢ [= *πρόσωπον*]:

⁵⁶ Smelova, *Biblical Allusions and Citations*, p. 389; *Melkite Syriac Hymns*, p. 129.

<p> .ᲛᲟᲑᲗ Მ ᲛᲟᲑᲗᲑᲗ .ᲛᲟ ᲛᲗᲗᲗᲑ, ᲛᲑᲑ, .ᲟᲛᲗᲗᲗ ᲛᲟᲑᲗ ᲗᲗ ᲑᲟᲑᲗ, Მ ᲗᲑᲗᲗ ᲑᲑᲑᲗ ᲛᲗᲗ Ბ </p>	<p> <i>but in one nature without confusion worshiped and glorified. Pray and supplicate to him, O glorified one and full of all our beauties, for the salvation of our souls.⁵⁹</i> </p>
---	---

If one ever had any doubt about the status of this hymn as a dogmatic text, this act of adaptation by a Church tradition that had rejected the Council of Chalcedon clearly shows that it was perceived as such. Both Syriac versions also demonstrate a far freer approach to translation than any of the Georgian or Slavic versions do, with various insertions and rephrasings. Additionally, as indicated above with respect to the choice of Mode (Second versus Second Plagal), there are typological similarities in the way that these hymns to the Mother of God are anthologized in both the Syriac and Georgian traditions: the collection of Syriac *theotokia* in NLR Syr. new series 11 is quite similar in its structure and makeup (hymns to the Mother of God grouped under eight tones) to the portions of the Iadgari titled შებმბანი და შებმბანი ყოლად წმიდისა და დიდებულისა, წმიდისა ღმრთისმშობლისანი ‘Lauds [lit. Adornments] and Praises of the All-Holy and Glorified Holy God-bearer’ – even if the contents of both anthologies overlap only to a certain degree (the one *dogmatikon* and *Sub tuum praesidium*).

Sub tuum praesidium Revisited

Having considered various cases of textual variation in the above three hymns from Iadgari and translations of the same in other languages, it makes sense to return now to the very first Marian hymn mentioned above, *Sub tuum praesidium*, the earliest known version of which is preserved in the Papyrus 470 (3rd or 4th c.) from the John Rylands Collection. P. Mercenier’s oft-quoted reconstruction of the Greek text, with original orthography, is reproduced here for convenience:

ὕ]πὸ [τὴν σκέπην τῆς
 εὐσπ[αγγνίας σου
 καταφε[ύγομεν, ὦ
 Θεοτόκε· τ[ὰς ἡμῶν
 ἰκεσίας μὴ πα[ρ-
 εἶδες ἐν περιστάσ[ει
 ἀλλ’ ἐκ κινδύνου
 ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς [σὸ ἡ μόνη [ἀγνή
 καὶ ἡ εὐλογ[ημένη⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Vat. sir. 94, ff. 145v–146r, quoted in: Smelova, *Melkite Syriac Hymns*, p. 129.

⁶⁰ Stegmüller, *Sub tuum praesidium*, pp. 76–77

This corresponds to the following in contemporary Greek liturgical usage (as a dismissal hymn at Great Vespers in the Horologion):

Ὑπὸ τὴν σὴν εὐσπλαγχνίαν, καταφεύγομεν, Θεοτόκε, τὰς ἡμῶν ἰκεσίας, μὴ παρίδῃς ἐν περιστάσει, ἀλλ' ἐκ κινδύνων λύτρωσαι ἡμᾶς, μόνη Ἄγνη, μόνη εὐλογημένη.

In the Iadgari, the Georgian text of the hymn (nearly identical in meaning to the Greek) is as follows:

შენსა მოწყალებსა მივილტვით, ღმრთისმშობელო, ჩვენსა ვერდებასა ნუ უგულებელს-ჰყოფ ჰირსა შინა, არამედ რისხვისაგან გვხსენ, მხოლოო [...]⁶¹

Under Thy mercy we flee for refuge, O God-bearer, despise not our supplication in constraint, but deliver us from wrath, O only [Pure and Blessed One].

In terms of translation technique, the choice of მოწყალება ‘mercy’ for Grk. *εὐσπλαγχνία*, a compound word deriving from *εὖ* ‘good’ + *σπλάγχχος* ‘bowels, inward part’ (i.e. the seat of the feelings), deserves some attention here. To this day, მოწყალება has remained the standard translation for *εὐσπλαγχνία* in liturgical Georgian, as evidenced by the translation of this same hymn in use in the modern Church of Georgia:

მოწყალებასა შენსა მივილტვით, წმიდაო ღვთისმშობელო, ვედრებასა ჩვენსა ნუ უგულებელ-ჰყოფ, არამედ დელვათა და ჰირთაგან გვიხსენ ჩვენ, მხოლოო კურთხეულო.⁶²

The Syriac translation likewise has ‘mercy’:

<p style="text-align: center;"> ܕܘܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܘܫܐܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, ܕܘܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܘܫܐܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, ܕܘܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܘܫܐܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, ܕܘܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܘܫܐܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, ܕܘܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܘܫܐܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, ܕܘܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܘܫܐܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, ܕܘܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܘܫܐܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, ܕܘܫܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܘܫܐܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ </p>	<p>Under the cover of your mercy we find protection, God-bearer, and we offer our supplication to you: Do not reject the prayer of your servants, but deliver us from every suffering, as you are the only pure and blessed one.⁶³</p>
--	---

⁶¹ Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი, p. 458, ll. 5–7; Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal*, p. 314. The final words are evidently missing, as the adjective მხოლოო ‘only’ is left without a complement, and all the other versions have some form of ‘Only Pure’, ‘Only Blessed’, or a combination thereof at the end.

⁶² quoted in Ebralidze, ღვთისმშობლის უძველესი ჰიმნი; further examples of მოწყალო/მოწყალება as translating *εὐσπλαγχνος/εὐσπλαγχνία* can be found in the the Oktoechos, e.g. in Ode 7 of the Resurrectional Canon for Tone 2, or in Ode 1 of the Canon to the Theotokos for Tone 7, cf. კვიორის დამისთევს მსახურებები... pp. 22, 83.

⁶³ Smelova, *Melkite Syriac Hymns*, p. 123

Interestingly, the (rather free) Latin versions of this hymn show some variation in this respect, translating it as either *miser ricordiam* (Ambrosian Rite) or *praesidium* (Roman Rite).⁶⁴ If *miser ricordiam* can be understood as conveying the sense of *ἐὸσπλαγγνία*, then *praesidium* apparently takes up the notion of *σκέπη* ‘protection’ found in early Greek versions of the text, such as that reconstructed from the John Rylands papyrus.

Perhaps the most interesting case of lexical variation is in Church Slavonic. The translation from the archaic East Slavic Horologion NLR Q.п.I.57 (f. 129r, dismissal of Vespers) is as follows:

Подъ твою мѣть прибѣгаемъ бѣе дѣо мѣтвѣ нашихъ не презри въ скорбьхъ нъ ѿ вѣдѣ избави нѣ ѿдинага чѣта и блѣгнага.

Meanwhile, post-Nikonian (Russian Synodal) Church Slavonic has here replaced мѣть with блѣгострѣбіе, a close morphological calque of *ἐὸσπλαγγνία*:

Подъ твоѣ блѣгострѣбіе прибѣгаемъ бѣе, молѣніа нѣша не прѣзри во ѡвстоаніи, но ѿ вѣдѣ ѡзбави ны ѣдіна чѣтаа, ѣдіна блѣгословѣннаа.⁶⁵

The Church Slavonic text of this hymn has thus, unlike the Georgian, Latin or Syriac, undergone a process of near-total ‘literalization’. This is arguably due to the greater derivational-morphological capabilities of Church Slavonic, which is far more readily able to calque Greek compound nouns and adjectives such as блѣгострѣбіе and блѣгострѣвенъ than are Latin, Syriac, or (Old) Georgian. While similar tendencies are doubtless also observable in Georgian and Syriac (as indicated above), the structure of the latter two languages is inherently less conducive to this kind of literal morphematic calquing or ‘loan translation’ (to use Betz’ terminology⁶⁶) – as seen in the case of the participial constructions in the *dog-*

⁶⁴ *Sub tuam misericordiam confugimus Dei Genitrix (ut) nostram deprecationem ne inducas in tentationem sed de periculo libera nos sola casta et benedicta* (Ambrosian, quoted in Ebralidze, ღვათისმშობლის უძველესი ჰიმნი); *Sub tuum praesidium confugimus, Sancta Dei Genitrix. Nostras deprecationes ne despicias in necessitatibus, sed a periculis cunctis libera nos semper, Virgo gloriosa et benedicta* (Roman, *ibid.*). The Ambrosian-rite version is less literal; the expression “ne inducas in tentationem” may be inspired by the similar petition in the Lord’s Prayer

⁶⁵ Часословъ, ff. 91v-92r. However, it is important to note that in actual liturgical practice in the modern Russian Orthodox Church, one finds Подъ твою милость... in practically free alternation with the revised Подъ твоѣ блѣгострѣбіе.... The phrasing of the older Church Slavonic translation clearly had considerable ‘sticking power’.

⁶⁶ cf. Betz, *Die Lehnbildungen; Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen*.

matikon. As a prospect for future research, it would be interesting to undertake a comparative study of translation techniques in a larger corpus of hymns from the Iadgari, e.g. for Sunday or various feasts, that are also known from the subsequent Eastern liturgical tradition.

Concluding Remarks

This preliminary investigation into hymns to Mary in the Most Ancient Iadgari has thus yielded a number of important results. First, it has been shown how hymns to the Mother of God from the thematically grouped sections in the Iadgari were liturgically ‘repurposed’ in the later Byzantine Horologion and Oktoechos. Second, a comparison of the early Georgian and Church Slavonic translated hymns with newer liturgical versions revealed a shift from freer to more literal translation techniques (to use Brock’s terminology, from ‘text-oriented’ to ‘reader-oriented’ translation), such as is generally observable over time in non-Greek cultures of the Byzantine Empire and periphery.⁶⁷ Third, the identification of the hymn ვინ გნატროს შენ, ყოლად წმიდაო ქალწულო... as the *theotokion dogmatikon* of the Sixth Mode from the Oktoechos makes it possible to backdate this text by a considerable amount, while forcing us to abandon the attribution of the *theotokia dogmatika* as a whole to John of Damascus along with the tendency to treat these texts as a single, coherent corpus. It is hoped that this preliminary study of these select few texts will serve as a template and springboard for further research into the rich Marian hymnography in the Iadgari and its legacy in the liturgical books of the Byzantine rite.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ cf. Brock, *Towards a History*.

⁶⁸ I am grateful to Dr. Tinatin Chronz, Prof. Aleksei Pentkovskii, Olga Hailova, John Pumphrey, and Marina Samsonova for reviewing drafts of this text and for their invaluable advice and suggestions, as well as to Olga Grinchenko of the Slavic and Eastern European Mediaeval Studies Group (SEEMGS) for her invitation to give a talk at the SEEMSG Annual Meeting on March 19, 2022 that eventually led to this article.

REFERENCES

- Andreev, *The Order of the Hours* = A. Andreev, “The Order of the Hours in the Yaroslavl Horologion”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 75 (2021), pp. 319–346.
- Betz, *Die Lehnbildungen* = W. Betz, “Die Lehnbildungen und der abendländische Sprachausgleich”, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 67 (1944), pp. 275–302.
- Betz, *Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen* = W. Betz, “Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen im Vor- und Frühdeutschen”, *Deutsche Wortgeschichte*, Vol. 1 (Walter de Gruyter: Berlin/New York, 1974), pp. 135–163.
- Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents* = T. H. Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith* (London: Methuen, 1899).
- Brock, *Towards a History* = S. Brock, “Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique”, R. Lavenant, (ed.), *III Symposium Syriacum 1980. Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures: Goslar, 7–11 sept. 1980* [= *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 221] (Rome: 1983), pp. 1–14.
- Bulaev, *Жанровый состав* = E. Bulaev, “Жанровый состав и типология древнейших рукописных октоихов” [“Genre Composition and Typology of Ancient Octoechoi”], *Христианское чтение* 2 (2019), pp/ 31–47.
- Chronz, Review of Renoux = T. Chronz, [Review of:] Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection II... / Les hymnes de la Résurrection III...*, *Oriens Christianus* 99 (2016), pp. 266–269.
- Conomos, *What is a Troparion?* = D. Conomos, “What is a Troparion?”, *Musicology Today* 12 (2012), pp. 1–14.
- Ebralidze, ღვთისმშობლის უძველესი ჰიმნი = L. Ebralidze, „ღვთისმშობლის უძველესი ჰიმნი“ [“The Oldest Hymn to the Mother of God”], *Orthodox Theology*, 2015, URL: <https://www.orthodoxtheology.ge/innomariano/> (accessed 31.03.2022).
- Förster, *Zur ältesten Überlieferung* = H. Förster, “Zur ältesten Überlieferung der marianischen Antiphon „Sub tuum praesidium“”. *Biblos* 44/2 (1995), pp. 183–192.
- Frøyshov, *The Early Development* = S. S. R. Frøyshov, “The Early Development of the Liturgical Eight-Mode System in Jerusalem”, *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 51/2–3 (2007), pp. 139–178.
- Frøyshov, *The Georgian Witness* = S. S. R. Frøyshov, “The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy: New Sources and Studies”. B. Groen, S. Hawkes-Teeples, S. Alexopoulos (ed.), *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship: Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Rome, 17–21 September 2008* [= *Eastern Christian Studies* 12] (Leuven: Peeters 2012), pp. 227–267.
- Gardner, *Altrussischer notierter Oktoich* = J. Gardner, “Altrussischer notierter Oktoich der Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal zu Paris”, *Acta Musicologica* 42, Fasc. 3/4 (Jul.–Dec. 1970), pp. 221–225.
- Gugushvili, *Богослужение ГПЦ* = S. Gugushvili, “Богослужения ГПЦ”/“Грузинская православная церковь. Часть II” [“Liturgy of the GOC”/“Georgian Orthodox Church. Pt. II”], *Православная энциклопедия*, Vol. 13, Moscow: Orthodox Encyclopedia Center, 2007, 229–280, URL: <https://www.pravenc.ru/text/639853.html> (accessed 23.06.2022).
- Hannick, *Le texte de l’Oktoechos* = C. Hannick, *Le texte de l’Oktoechos. Dimanche: Office selon les*

- huit tons* [= *La prière des églises de rite byzantin 3*] (Chevetogne, 1971), pp. 37-60.
- Hannick, *The Theotokos in Byzantine hymnography* = C. Hannick, “The Theotokos in Byzantine hymnography: typology and allegory”, M. Vassilaki (ed.), *Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium* (London/New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 69-76.
- Jeffrey, *The Earliest Christian Chant Repertory Recovered* = P. Jeffrey, “The Earliest Christian Chant Repertory Recovered: The Georgian Witnesses to Jerusalem Chant”, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 47/1 (Spring, 1994), pp. 1-38.
- Kujumdzieva, *The Hymnographic Book* = S. Kujumdzieva, *The Hymnographic Book of Tropologion* (London/New York: Routledge, 2018).
- Khevsuriani, *Iadgari* = L. Khevsuriani, “Иадгари” [“Iadgari”]. *Православная энциклопедия*, Vol. 20 (Moscow: Orthodox Encyclopedia Center, 2009), pp. 419-424, URL: <https://pravenc.ru/text/200125.html> (accessed 01.04.2022).
- Metreveli et al., უძველესი იადგარი = E. Metreveli, T. Chankievi, L. Khevsuriani, უძველესი იადგარი [= ძველი ქართული მწერლობის ძეგლები II] [*The Most Ancient Iagari* (= *Monuments of Old Georgian Literature II*)] (Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1980).
- Mihálykó, *The Christian Liturgical Papyri* = A. T. Mihálykó, *The Christian Liturgical Papyri* (Tübingen, 2019).
- Permiakov, *Obnovlenie Khrama Voskreseniia* = V. Permiakov, “Обновление Храма Воскресения Христова в Иерусалиме” [“Encaenia of the Church of the Resurrection of Christ in Jerusalem”], *Православная энциклопедия*, Vol. 52 (Moscow: Orthodox Encyclopedia Center, 2018), pp. 252-257.
- Pletneva, *Pevcheskaia kniga «Oktoikh»* = E. V. Pletneva, *Pevcheskaia kniga «Oktoikh» v drevenerusskoi traditsii (po rukopisiam XI–XV vekov)* [*The Liturgical Book of the Oktoechos in the Old Russian Tradition (On the Basis of 11th–15th Century Manuscripts)*], Dissertation (Saint Petersburg, 2006).
- Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection I* = C. Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection I. Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne: textes du Sinaï 18* [= *Sources liturgiques 3*] (Paris: Cerf, 2000).
- Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection II* = C. Renoux, *Les Hymnes de la Résurrection II. Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne. Texte des manuscrits Sinaï 40, 41 et 34* [= *Patrologia Orientalis* 231 (52.1)] (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010).
- Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection III* = C. Renoux, *Les Hymnes de la Résurrection III. Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne. Introduction, traduction, annotation des manuscrits Sinaï 26 et 20 et index analytique des trois volumes* [= *Patrologia Orientalis* 232 (52.2)] (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012).
- Sakvarelidze, *Some Aspects of the Byzantinization* = N. Sakvarelidze, “Some Aspects of the Byzantinization of the Georgian Liturgy: The Example of the Menaion”, B. Groen, D. Galadza et al. (eds.), *Rites and Rituals of the Christian East: Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Lebanon, 10–15 July 2012* [= *Eastern Christian Studies* 22] (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), pp. 255-291.
- Shanidze et al. (eds.), ჭილ-ეჭრატის იადგარი = A. Shanidze, A. Martirosov, A. Jishiashvili (eds.), ჭილ-ეჭრატის იადგარი [*The Papyrus-Parchment Iadgari*] [= ძველი ქართული ენის ძეგლები/*Monuments of Old Georgian Language* 15] (Tbilisi, 1977).
- Shchepetkin, *Chasoslov XIV veka* = A. Shchepetkin, “Часослов XIV века О. П. I. 2 в сравнении

- с другими древнерусскими часословами” [“The 14th c. Old Russian Horologion O. П. I. 2 in Comparison with Other Old Russia Horologia”], *Церковь. Богословие. История. Материалы VII Всероссийской научно-богословской конференции (Екатеринбург, 8–10 февраля 2019 г.)* [Church. Theology. History. Proceedings of the 7th All-Russian Theology Conference, Ekaterinburg, 8–10 February, 2019] (Ekaterinburg, 2019), pp. 197-208.
- Shchepetkin, *Sutochnyi bogoslužebnyi krug* = A. Shchepetkin, “Суточный богослужебный круг по древнерусскому Часослову XIV в.” [“The Daily Liturgical Cycle According to the 14th c. Old Russian Horologion”], *Труды отдела древнерусской литературы* [Proceedings of the Department of Old Russian Literature] LXVII (2020), pp. 21-35.
- Schneider, *Lobpreis im rechten Glauben* = Schneider, *Lobpreis im rechten Glauben: Die Theologie der Hymnen an den Festen der Menschwerdung der alten Jerusalemer Liturgie im Georgischen Udzelesi Iadgari* [= *Hereditas: Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte* 23] (Bonn: Borengässer, 2004).
- Shoemaker, *Mary in Early Christian Faith* = S. J. Shoemaker, *Mary in Early Christian Faith and Devotion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016).
- Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal* = S. J. Shoemaker, *The First Christian Hymnal: The Songs of The Ancient Jerusalem Church* [= *Eastern Christian Texts* 10] (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 2018).
- Smelova, *Biblical Allusions and Citations* = N. Smelova, “Biblical Allusions and Citations in the Syriac Theotokia According to the MS Syr. New Series 11 of the National Library of Russia, St Petersburg”, D. Thomas (ed.), *The Bible in Arabic Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Smelova, *Melkite Syriac Hymns* = N. Smelova, “Melkite Syriac Hymns to the Mother of God (9th–11th centuries): Manuscripts, Language and Imagery”, L. Brubaker, M. B. Cunningham (eds.), *The Cult of the Mother of God in Byzantium: Texts and Images* (Farnham, UK/Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 119-131.
- Stegmüller, *Sub tuum praesidium* = O. Stegmüller, “*Sub tuum praesidium*. Bemerkungen zur ältesten Überlieferung”, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 74 (1952), pp. 76-82.
- Stegmüller, *Fragmente frühchristlicher Poesie* = O. Stegmüller, *Fragmente frühchristlicher Poesie zum Epiphaniestagekreis*, Dissertation (Freiburg i. Br., 1941).
- Thomson, *Towards a typology of errors* = F. J. Thomson, “Towards a typology of errors in Slavonic translations”, E. G. Ferrugia, R. Taft, G. K. Piovesana (eds.), *Christianity among the Slavs. The heritage of Saints Cyril and Methodius. Acts of the International Congress held on the eleventh centenary of the death of St Methodius, Rome, October 8–11, 1985* [= *Orientalia Christiana analecta* 231] (Rome: Pontificale Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1988), pp. 351-380.
- Vershinin, *Drevnerusskoe tolkovanie* = K. V. Vershinin, “Древнерусское толкование на догматику восьми гласов” [“An Old Rus’ Commentary on the Dogmatika in the Eight Tones”], *Труды Института русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова* [Proceedings of the V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute] 1 (2021), pp. 41-55.
- Wickham, *Chalkedon* = L. R. Wickham, “Chalkedon, ökumenische Synode”, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, Vol. 7 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1981), 668–675, URL: https://www.degruyter.com/database/TRE/entry/tre.07_668_30/html (digital version published 2010; accessed 01.04.2022).
- Zhelto, *Stikhiry voskresnogo oktoikha* = M. Zhelto, “Стихиры воскресного октоиха в древнем топологии” [“Stichera of the Sunday Oktoechos among the hymns of the Ancient Tropolo-

- gion”], *Христианское чтение* 3 (2018), pp. 94-111.
- Zhelto, *Dogmatik* = M. Zhelto, “Догматик” [“Dogmatikon”], *Православная энциклопедия*, Vol. 15 (Moscow: Orthodox Encyclopedia Center, 2007), 533, URL: <https://pravenc.ru/text/178709.html> (accessed 01.04.2022).
- Wade, *The Oldest Iadgari* = A. Wade, “The Oldest Iadgari: The Jerusalem Tropologion, V–VIII c.”, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 50 (1984), 4pp. 51-456.
- Wade, *The Jerusalem Tropologion* = A. Wade, “The Jerusalem Tropologion – 4th to 8th Centuries, 30 Years after the Publication”, D. Atanassova, T. Chronz (eds.), *Σύναξις καθολική: Beiträge zu Gottesdienst und Geschichte der fünf altkirchlichen Patriarchate für Heinzgerd Brakmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Vol. 2 (Vienna: Lit Verlag, 2014), pp. 717-750.

PRIMARY SOURCES

- NLR Q.п.I.57. Horologion. 13th c. Descr.: No. 322, *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР, 11-13 вв.* [Master Catalogue of Church Slavonic Manuscript Books Kept in the USSR, 11th-13th cc.] (Moscow: Nauka, 1984), 285.
- Ms. Moscow RGADA 381.1/75, Oktoechos, 14th c.
- Ms. Moscow RGB, fonds 113, No. 349, Oktoechos, 15th c.
- Ms. Sof. 123, Oktoechos, 14th c.
- Ὠκτώηχъ, сѣрѣчь Ѡсмогласникъ, съ ѿ_гв гласа по ѿ_ѿ (Moscow: Synodal Printing House, 1893 [repr. Moscow: Pravilo very, 2012]).
- Часослѡвъ (Moscow: Synodal Printing House, 1912 [repr. Moscow: Pravilo very, 2013]).
- კვირის ღამისთვის მსახურებები პარაკლიტონის (რვა ხმის) მიხედვით [Sunday Vigil Services According to the Paraklitikē (Eight Tones)], 2015.

Institute for Slavic Studies,
Heidelberg University (Germany)
walker.thompson@slav.uni-heidelberg.de

ღვთისმშობლის საგალობელი უძველეს იადგარში

რეზიუმე

ამ სტატიაში განხილულია ღვთისმშობლისადმი მიძღვნილი სამი, მანამდე არაიდენტიფიცირებული, საგალობლის (ან თეოტოკიონის) ისტორია ძველ ქართულ ტროპოლოგიონში („უძველესი იადგარიდან“), რომელთაც მოგვიანებით ბიზანტიურ ლიტურგიაში – კერძოდ, ახალ-საბაიტურ ოქტოიხოსში და შუა საუკუნეების ბერძნულ და სლავურ ჰოროლოგიონებში განსაკუთრებული ადგილი ენიჭებათ მწუხრის საღამოს (*esperinos*) და სერობის (*apodeipnon*) მსახურებებში.

კვლევამ აჩვენა, რომ უძველესი იადგარიდან აღებული ეს საგალობლები არა მხოლოდ წარმოაჩენს ადრეულ ქრისტიანულ ეპოქაში ღვთისმშობლის თაყვანისცემას, არამედ ასევე საყურადღებოა აღმოსავლეთ ქრისტიანული სამყაროს ღვთისმსახურებაში ღვთისმშობლისადმი მიძღვნილი ჰიმნოგრაფიის განვითარების ისტორიისათვის. გარდა ამისა, ბერძნულ, ქართულ, სლავურ და სირიულ ენებზე არსებული ამ საგალობლების შესწავლა იძლევა საშუალებას წარმოვაჩინოთ ჰიმნოგრაფიული ტექსტების თარგმანის განვითარების ისტორიის აქამდე არასათანადოდ შესწავლილი მნიშვნელოვანი ასპექტი, კერძოდ, თავისუფალი თარგმანიდან უფრო ზუსტ, ორიგინალთან უფრო დაახლოებულ თარგმანზე გადასვლა, რაც შეინიშნება გვიანი შუა საუკუნეებიდან მოყოლებული ბიზანტიის იმპერიის პერიფერიაზე განლაგებული ქვეყნების კულტურებში. ეს ეხება განსახილველი საგალობლების როგორც ქართული, ისე საეკლესიო სლავური ტექსტების რედაქტირებას უფრო მოგვიანო პერიოდში.

განსაკუთრებით საინტერესოა ღვთისმშობლისადმი მიძღვნილი საგალობელი, რომელიც ფართოდ იყო ცნობილი გვიან შუა საუკუნეების ბიზანტიურ ტრადიციაში, როგორც მეორე პლაგალური (ანუ მეექვსე) ხმის “Theotokion Dogmatikon”. წინა პერიოდის მეცნიერებაში ეს ჰიმნი ჩვეულებრივ მიეწერებოდა წმინდა იოანე დამასკელს და უკავშირდებოდა შვიდ სხვა დოგმატიკას ბერძნული ოქტოიხოსის რვახმიან სტრუქტურაში – მიუხედავად იმისა, რომ უძველეს იადგარში, ისევე როგორც ზოგიერთ არაქალკედონურ სირიულ ხელნაწერში, იგი ჩასმულია მეორე (არაპლაგალური) ხმაში. ამ საგალობლის გამოვლენა უძველეს იადგარში გვაძლევს გადავხედოთ როგორც მის დათარიღებას, ასევე მთლიანობაში Theotokia Dogmatika-ს ავტორობის და ამ საგალობლების ცალკე, ერთ ციკლად დაჯგუფების საკითხებს. გარდა ამისა, ქართული ტექსტის ბერძნულ ორიგინალთან შედარება საშუალებას გვაძლევს გადავამოწმოთ Renoux-ს და Shoemaker-ის მოსაზრებები საგალობლის აშკარად ქრისტოლოგიური ხასიათის ტერმინოლოგიისა და ამ ჰიმნის როგორც ქალკედონური წესის ადრეული გამოხატულების შესახებ და, ასევე, გამოვიკვლიოთ, თუ როგორ ესმოდათ ეს ტერმინოლოგია ქრისტიანული აღმოსავლეთში მთარგმნელთა შემდგომ თაობებს.

სლავური კვლევების ინსტიტუტი

ჰაილდერბერგის უნივერსიტეტი (გერმანია)

walker.thompson@slav.uni-heidelberg.de

უოკერ ტომპსონი